Health Canada Sante Canada

Program Evaluation Division
Policy and Consultation Branch

Division de l'évaluation des programmes
Direction générale des politiques et de la consultation

FAMILY VIOLENCE - EVALUATION FRAMEWORK

1992-95 INTERDEPARTMENTAL INITIATIVE

June 1991

Canada

MISSION STATEMENT

The Program Evaluation Division helps Health Canada serve Canadians better by providing objective information and advice about the effectiveness of departmental activities and services.

ÉNONCÉ DE MISSION

La Division de l'évaluation des programmes aide Santé Canada à mieux servir les Canadiens et les Canadiennes en offrant une information et des conseils objectifs sur l'efficacité des activités et des services du Ministère.

104-00500/

FAMILY VIOLENCE

EVALUATION FRAMEWORK

1992-95 INTERDEPARTMENTAL INITIATIVE

Program Audit and Review Directorate
Health and Welfare Canada

June 1991

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

SUMMARY. 1

PART I INTRODUCTION. 2

PART II PROGRAM COMPONENT PROFILE. 3

2.0 Background 3

2.1 Mandate. 5

2.2 Objectives 6

2.3 Activities 7

2.4 Outputs. 9

2.5 Expected Results 10

2.6 Federal Coordination 10

PART III EVALUATION DESIGN 12

3.1 Potential and Priority Evaluation Issues & Questions . . 12

3.2 Proposed Methodological Approaches 16

3.3 Proposed Data Collection Methods 16

3.3.1 Statistics Canada Data Collection on Family Violence 16

3.3.2 Other Data and Information Sources 20

PART IV EVALUATION OPTIONS 21

4.1 Final Evaluation Options 21

4.1.1 "Medium" Option (I). 21

4.1.2 "Maximal" Option (II). 21

4.2 Mid-Term Evaluation Option. 21

4.3 Cost-Effectiveness in Evaluation 25

APPENDIX A
Data Collection Methods and Indicators for the Evaluation Questions. 26

SUMMARY

This document sets out the evaluation strategy for the recently announced $136 million, four year (1991-95), Family Violence Initiative. It is initiated in response to the Treasury Board directive (TBS 815370) related to the approval of the joint submission of the Ministers of Health & Welfare, Indian and Northern Development, Justice, Solicitor General, Secretary of State, Multiculturalism and Citizenship and of the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation for the renewal of the 1986 Child Sexual Abuse Initiative and the 1988 Family Violence Initiative.

The purpose of the Evaluation Framework is to insure credible and useful mid-term and final evaluations of the renewed Family Violence Initiative. Specifically it is to:

- clarify the objectives, activities, outputs and expected effects of this Initiative;
- describe and demonstrate the assumed causal relationships between the activities and outputs and the objectives and expected effects of the program;
- identify key issues and questions which could be addressed in the mid-term and final evaluations; and
- propose and prioritize optional methods for addressing the evaluation issues and questions.

This is being prepared to comply with Treasury Board directive TBS 815370 to submit to the Board before June 1, 1991 evaluation plans (an interdepartmental evaluation framework) for both the overall initiative and the departmental activities.

Health and Welfare Canada will also continue to coordinate the submission of an annual report to Treasury Board on the Family Violence Initiative.

PART I INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this report is to provide an Evaluation Framework for the renewed Family Violence Initiative (1991-92 through 1994-95) and to propose a set of issues, methodological approaches and options for the mid-term and final evaluations of this program. It is initiated in response to the Treasury Board directive (TBS 815370) related to the approval of the joint submission of the Ministers of Health & Welfare, Indian and Northern Development, Justice, Solicitor General, Secretary of State, Multiculturalism and Citizenship and of the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation for the renewal of the 1986 Child Sexual Abuse Initiative and the 1988 Family Violence Initiative. This directive requires that, the Minister of Health & Welfare, in collaboration with the Ministers of the other funded departments and Corporation, take the lead:

- in conducting an evaluation of both the overall initiative (with particular emphasis on the interdepartmental coordinating mechanism) and the individual activities;

- in submitting to Treasury Board Secretariat before June 1, 1991 evaluation plans (an interdepartmental evaluation framework) for both the overall initiative and the departmental activities, including evaluation criteria for all activities (to be done in consultation with the Office of the Comptroller General);

- in conducting a mid-term evaluation to be completed by March 31,1992; and

- a final evaluation to be carried out by March 31, 1994, one year before the end of the Initiative, according to the Office of the Comptroller General, which will transcend departmental boundaries and is to focus in particular on examining the effectiveness of measures taken to insure coordination and lack of duplication between the various departmental responsibilities under this Initiative.

The purpose for the development of an Evaluation Framework is to insure credible and useful mid-term and final evaluations of the renewed Family Violence Initiative. In general the purposes of this evaluation framework are to:

. clarify the objectives, activities, outputs and expected effects of this Initiative;

- describe and demonstrate the assumed causal relationships between the activities and outputs and the objectives and expected effects of the program;

- identify key issues and questions which could be addressed in the mid-term and final evaluation; and

- propose and prioritize optional methods for addressing the evaluation issues and questions.

The approach to preparing these evaluation plans included the following:

- reviews of documentation on past and future program activities, past evaluations and proposed evaluation plans of the participating departments and the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation.

- consultations with program evaluators from the participating departments and data experts of Statistics Canada.

This framework study follows the guidelines of the Office of the Comptroller General.

PART II
PROGRAM COMPONENT PROFILES

2.0 Background

A draft federal working definition of family violence characterizes it as broad concept that includes intra and extra familial abuse of children and youth, of the elderly and of people with disabilities particularly when in a state of dependency, or involving abuse of a position of trust or authority, and abuse of women by their male partners. Some researchers would expand this definition to explicitly include partner abuse by either sex. Family violence in addition to physical assault can take the form of intimidation, mental or emotional abuse, sexual abuse, neglect, deprivation and financial exploitation. It is considered to be a social, health, and criminal problem with serious results for individuals, families, and society.

The principal responsibility for providing family violence services to Canadians rests with the provinces. However, the federal government also has a key role to play in addressing this issue, with regard to its mandate in such areas as criminal law, federal policing and corrections, services to Indians on-reserve, and its position of leadership in addressing issues of national concern.

To this effect the Government of Canada has taken several initiatives towards developing a national approach to address these issues, problems and concerns:

- in 1981 the Ministers of Justice and National Health and Welfare set up the Badgley Committee to investigate sexual offenses against children and youth;

- in the early eighties fostered the creation of a working group of federal, provincial and territorial Ministers Responsible for Status of Women on wife battering;

- established a Special Committee on Pornography and Prostitution (Fraser Committee) including child pornography in 1983;

- in 1987 a Special Advisor to the Minister of Health and Welfare was appointed to make recommendations for action that the federal government could take for the long-term prevention of child sexual abuse;

- in 1986 National Health and Welfare and the Department of Justices launched a $25.1 million, five year (1986-91) Child Sexual Abuse Initiative. This funding was for projects in prevention, treatment, professional education and training and the evaluation of innovative programs. During this period amendments to the Criminal Code and the Canada Evidence Act were introduced to improve the protection of children against sexual abuse (Bill C-15)..

The Minister of National Health and Welfare and the Minister responsible for the Status of Women in 1988 announced the first Family Violence Initiative involving five departments and the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation. This was a $40 million initiative with the following key elements:

- expand the knowledge base on Family Violence and heighten public awareness of this issue;

- the provision of new beds in emergency shelter units for battered women and their children;

- the development of new policy approaches including mechanisms for linking victims with other social and health services;

- research on effectiveness of alternatives to incarceration for abusers; and

- foster greater willingness among various professionals and others to work together (e.g., a national conference on Family Violence including representatives of governments, non-governmental organizations and recognized authorities);

- establish a mechanism for national coordination and information exchange through National Clearinghouse on Family Violence;

- improve coordination among criminal justice, health and social service systems; and

- consultations with the provincial and territorial governments and non-governmental organizations to identify priorities for national action on family violence.

The objectives of this Initiative were:

- to support and encourage initiatives to reduce the incidence and effects of Family Violence in Canada;

- to foster partnership and cooperation with communities, the voluntary sector and provincial and territorial government; and

- to focus public and government attention on the issue.

2.1 Mandate

The new four year initiative began April 1, 1991. It will build on and integrate the current Initiatives on Family Violence and Child Sexual Abuse, and concentrate on areas of federal jurisdiction, expertise and leadership as well as areas identified as priorities by the provinces/ territories (through the consultation process). These areas were identified as priorities during recent federal consultations with other levels of government, non-government, professional and voluntary organizations. The provincial and territorial governments in particular emphasized the need for action within areas of federal jurisdiction.

The Initiative puts in place a range of federal programs across six federal departments and the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation that are essential to a substantive federal response to Family Violence. Within the overall Initiative, departments will also develop and coordinate focused action plans for priority populations such as aboriginal people, persons with disabilities and ethnocultural and visible minorities and residents of rural and remote areas.

2.2 Objectives

The new Family Violence Initiative comprises six major program elements:

. Increase Public Awareness and Prevention Action	$30.0 million
. Strengthen the Federal Legal Framework	7.0 --
. Provide Services and Training to Indians on Reserve	38.1 --
. Strengthen Intervention and Treatment Services	30.9 --
. Increase Availability of Housing for Victims	21.0 --
. Enhance National Coordination and Information Exchange	9.0 --
TOTAL	$136.0 million

The distribution of additional Person years (34 PYs) by sponsoring departments is as follows:

Health and Welfare Canada	10
Justice	7
Solicitor General	10
Indian Affairs and Northern Development	3
Secretary of State	2 PYs (91-92) & 4 PYs (92-93 to 94-95)
Multiculturalism and Citizenship	1

CMHC delivery mechanisms will absorb the delivery costs under the new Initiative using already authorized PY levels.

The six program elements are designed to:

- increase public awareness and community involvement in preventive action, and the promotion of social values that support equal rights and security for women, children and seniors;

- strengthen the federal legal framework on family violence by reviewing policy and legislation on family violence issues, and to monitor current child sexual abuse legislation in preparation for parliamentary review in 1992;

- provide prevention, protection and treatment services to Indians on reserve and Inuit;

- strengthen criminal justice, health and social service intervention and treatment services, particularly for high risk populations;

- increase longer term housing alternatives for victims of family violence and continue to make available emergency shelters through Project Haven;

- enhance national information exchange and coordination through the National Clearinghouse on Family Violence and other mechanisms, and establish a solid national base on the extent of family violence.

The proposed Initiative complements other major health, social policy and criminal justice initiatives.

2.3 Activities

The detailed program activities under each program elements are as follows:

Increase Public Awareness and Prevention Action (several departments are involved)

. Support 500 projects initiated by women's, disabled persons', aboriginal, ethnocultural and visible minorities, children's service organizations and others, to mobilize community action and education on wife, child and senior abuse.

. Develop and distribute public education material to meet an expected 15,000 requests per year.

. Undertake 40 co-ventures with service clubs, non-government organizations, business, labour and media agencies aimed at the prevention of family violence.

Strengthen the Federal Legal Framework (Justice)

. Review provisions of the Criminal Code and Divorce Act and other legal policies and practices on:

  - removal of offenders from home;

  - child abduction, custody and access;

  - corporal punishment for children;

- charging and sentencing offenders;

- child pornography.

. Monitor and defend federal child sexual abuse legislation (Bill C-15) against charter challenges and prepare for parliamentary review of legislation in 1992.

Provide Services to Indians On-Reserve and Inuit

. Prevention, protection and treatment programs for approximately 580 Indian communities (Indian Affairs and Northern Development).

. Develop family violence prevention curriculum for use in federally-funded schools for status Indian children (Medical Services Branch, Health and Welfare Canada).

. Train 2000 existing health and social services personnel (Health and Welfare Canada)

. Develop resources for police on reserve to support community action on family violence (Solicitor General).

Strengthen Intervention and Treatment Services (Solicitor General)

. Intensify the training offered to 800 to 1000 new recruits attending the RCMP Academy each year, and support and deliver specialized training for RCMP members serving in about 700 detachments across Canada, and staff and members of the Correctional Service of Canada and the National Parole Board.

. Test and evaluate new and innovative approaches to the delivery and coordination of services to victims of family violence by police in cooperation with other community partners.

. Provide treatment services for offenders in all 60 federal correctional institutions and develop effective community programming for abusers and their families to address issues related to family violence.

- Undertake research to better understand the importance of family violence as a factor in risk assessments and parole decision-making, and examine the impact that family violence has on victims and their families and how this relates to support for offenders on parole.

- Produce public and professional informational resources to help police, corrections and parole staff educate themselves, their clients and others about family violence and that promote effective prevention and intervention strategies.

The federal government (Health and Welfare Canada) will also work in partnership with provincial, territorial and municipal governments, professional associations and community groups to improve services to victims and their families in the fields of health and social services. It will:

- support 10 major demonstration projects to find out which approaches help victims and their families and prevent abuse from recurring;

- help produce manuals, handbooks and guidelines for Canadian physicians, nurses, social workers, mental health workers and other front-line workers; and

- share, with provincial and territorial governments, health and social service agencies and community groups across the country, information about what works so that all can learn from the success of others.

Increase the Availability of Housing for Victims (Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation)

- Funding for construction of 150 to 170 dwelling units of second stage housing plus between 80 to 100 additional emergency shelter units.

Enhance National Coordination and Information Exchange (Health and Welfare Canada)

- Increase the coverage and information base of the National Clearinghouse on Family Violence.

- Develop national information links with provincial and regional resource centres.

- Improve the national data base on the extent of family violence.

- Coordinate and evaluate federal Family Violence programs.

2.4 Outputs

The outputs from the renewed Initiative will include:

- more and better prevention and treatment facilities and information material for various stakeholders on family violence;
- projects funded and completed under the various departmental initiatives, and project evaluations;
- reports of meetings and consultations with other Federal, provincial and territorial, and non-government officials and professionals working in the area of family violence. These should yield some indicative findings as to how well the new Initiative is achieving its objectives by program element;
- development of a national data base on family violence
- mid-term and final evaluations of the overall Initiative and of individual departmental/Corporation program elements.

2.5 Expected Results

The results expected from the activities of the five departments and the CMHC in the prevention of family violence include:

- increased public awareness and sensitivity to family violence and the promotion of social values with respect to the rights/ security of women, children and seniors;
- a strengthened federal legal framework to enhance overall prevention efforts;
- improved intervention and treatment services for victims and offenders;
- enhanced prevention, protection and treatment services for Indians on-reserve and Inuit;
- increased availability of longer term housing and emergency shelters for victims of family violence;
- improved national information/data collection and exchange:
- improved training materials for professionals and others working in this area;

MODEL OF THE FEDERAL INTERDEPARTMENTAL FAMILY VIOLENCE INITIATIVE

Activities	Increased Public Awareness & Prevention Action by Public at Large.	Strengthen Federal Legal Framework	Strengthen Intervention/Treatment Services	Provide Services to Indians on Reserve & Inuit.	Increased Housing for victims.	Enhanced National Coordination & Information Exchange
Outputs *	- Partnerships in 500 Projects to Address Attitudes & Spur Community Action - Consultations: CRTC & Media Outlets - Demonstration Projects - Distribute Public Education Material - Co-ventures with Service Clubs (40) - Meetings with Provinces & NGOs - Contributions to Longer-term Federal Strategy	- Review provisions "Criminal Code and Divorce Act etc... re Treatment of Victim, Offenders.	- Training of Police, Parole & Corrections Officers - Training Materials to Inform Legal System Workers and Other Professionals (Physicians, Health workers, etc...) - Treatment Programs - Test/Evaluate New Approaches through Demonstration Projects	- Prevention, Protection & Treatment Programs - Prevention Curriculum for Federal-Provincial Schools - Train 2,000 Health/ Social Services Personnel - Resources for Police on Reserves.	- Longer-term Housing (150-170 units) and Project Haven Transition Housing (80-100)	- Better Coverage/ Information for National Clearinghouse on Family Violence - Link up Federal/ Provincial and other Data/Information. - Coordinate/Evaluate National Initiatives - Improved Database on Nature/Extent of Family Violence - No. of Requests for Information Responded To.
Impacts & Effects	- A More Sensitized and Compassionate Public. - Information on Prevention Programs That Work and Why They Work - Involvement of Canadians at the Community Level	- More Just Treatment under the Law of Victims and Offenders. - New Knowledge on Legal Service Approaches to Family Violence Victims & Offenders - Use of New Services & Service Delivery Approaches by NGOs, Criminal Justice Agencies & Provincial Gov'ts re: Family Violence	- Materials Disseminated to Service Providers - Increased Awareness by Providers of Services of Family Violence (Enhanced Services) - New Knowledge on Efficacy of New Approaches	- New Knowledge on Efficacy of Various Approaches to Alleviating Problems on Indian Reserves and among Inuit.	- New Knowledge on Differential Impact of Housing for Victims (Quality of Life)	- Issues Identified for Future Joint Efforts with Provinces & NGOs - Support Built for Future Joint Strategies - Enhanced Federal & Provincial Cooperation - Joint Future Plans for Addressing Family Violence Problems - Better Information
Objectives	←	- To Support/Encourage Initiatives to Reduce Family Violence - To Foster Partnerships/Cooperation with Communities, Voluntary Sector, Provincial & Territorial Governments	- Assure Effective Use of Funds i.e. Prevent Duplication - Improve Partnership Among Various Interest Groups (Government, NGOs Professional Associations)	→		
Inter-departmental Objectives		REDUCED FAMILY VIOLENCE				

* Individual Departmental & Interdepartmental Mid-Term & Final Evaluations

- increased attention to the needs of particular target groups for this initiative, i.e., ethnocultural and visible minorities, aboriginal people, disabled persons, people in rural and isolated areas and seniors.

- a more comprehensive, cohesive and successful national approach to addressing family violence; and

- development of a network of resource centres

2.6 Federal Coordination

Overall coordination is by an Interdepartmental Steering Committee (ISC) on Family Violence consisting of Assistant Deputy Ministers or equivalents from sixteen Federal Departments and Agencies. Two other committees report to the ISC -- the Interdepartmental Working Group and the Interdepartmental Evaluation Working Group.

The Interdepartmental Working Group (IWG) composed of representatives of the responsibility centre managers in each of these sixteen Departments and Agencies coordinates all efforts under the new Initiative. It is assisted in this task by a smaller coordinating committee of program officers from the funded departments and Status of Women Canada, the Funding Programs Group Committee. An Interdepartmental Communications Working Group coordinates the publicity about the Initiative. An Evaluation Working Group (EWG) coordinates evaluation of activities and funding under the Initiative. (Other sub-committees have been or are being established to coordinate action on special issues, such as research and needs of persons with disabilities.)

The Family Violence Prevention Division of Social Services Programs Branch, Health and Welfare Canada, provides secretariat services to many of these committees and operates two essential information gathering systems:

. the National Clearinghouse on Family Violence: provides information and referral services on Family Violence related issues to all levels of government, health and social services professionals, front line service providers and the general public;

. the Family Violence Information Tracking System: a monitoring/reporting system on funding by all departments and agencies and their end products.

The following logic model summarizes the activities, outputs, intended impacts and effects, and objectives of the new Family Violence Initiative.

PART III EVALUATION DESIGN

3.1 Potential and Priority Evaluation Issues & Questions

Program Audit and Review Directorate (PARD) in consultation with the other participating departments has developed this draft list of evaluation questions and sub-questions which are grouped according to the four major categories of priority concerns or issues addressed in periodic program evaluation. These basic evaluation issues are:

RATIONALE: Is the program still relevant?

OBJECTIVE ACHIEVEMENT: Has the program achieved what was expected?

IMPACTS/EFFECTS: What has happened as a result of the program?

ALTERNATIVES: Are there better and more cost effective ways of achieving the objectives?

These major categories of evaluation issues are those recommended in the Treasury Board of Canada, Comptroller-General, Working Standards for the Evaluation of Programs in Federal Departments and Agencies (1989).

Each evaluation question was rated separately against the following criteria:

- Is it possible to answer to this question?
- Is it likely that a program evaluation would be able to produce credible evidence to answer this question or reduce or eliminate uncertainty about the answer?
- Is the issue to be illuminated of sufficient importance either to the success of the current Initiative or to the mid-term or final evaluations?
- Is the likely cost of getting an answer justifiable in light of the preceding criteria?

Only questions that could be answered are proposed. A priority rating was applied to these questions of **"HIGH"** (essential to the evaluation), **"MEDIUM"** (important but not essential) or **"LOW"** (interesting question but neither essential nor important to the evaluation). The data/information sources and performance indicators for each of the evaluation questions are discussed in detail in Appendix A.

The full list of evaluation questions follows, grouped under the four basic evaluation issues.

These are "generic" questions since the affected departments or CMHC may be required to develop subsidiary questions to further illuminate specific issues of particular interest to individual departments or the Corporation.

In preparing these questions it is also recognized that not all the sponsoring departments and CMHC may be able to develop information in each of these areas but should try to when relevant to measuring the success of specific departmental or agency initiatives.

1. ISSUE ONE: PROGRAM RATIONALE (Do the activities under the Interdepartmental initiative still make sense?)

1.1 To what extent does the federal government continue to attach priority to the issue of Family Violence? Priority: HIGH

1.2 Are current activities still consistent with the overall objectives of the Initiative? Priority: HIGH

2. ISSUE TWO: OBJECTIVE ACHIEVEMENT (has the program achieved what was expected?)

2.1 What has happened as a result of the initiative? Has there been an increase in the number, accessibility, and effectiveness of services in Canada for the prevention of, protection from, and treatment of family violence? Priority: HIGH

2.2 To what extent can any increase in the number, accessibility, and effectiveness of services in Canada for the prevention of, protection from, and treatment of family violence be attributed wholly or partly to the efforts of the different federal departmental/Corporation activities? Priority: HIGH

2.3 Were appropriate mechanisms (i.e., assessment criteria) put in place to facilitate coordination, prevent duplication and select among project proposals within and across funding departments and agencies and between federal, provincial, municipal, community, etc... departments or agencies? Are there more cost-effective ways that might have been used to fund or administer the Initiative? Priority: HIGH

2.4 To what extent have the activities conducted under the Initiative resulted in increased attention to the problem of family violence by Non-Government Organizations, provincial and territorial governments as evidenced by the introduction of new services, new delivery approaches, new policies? What effect did it have on partnerships and cooperation among the federal, provincial, territorial governments, communities and the voluntary sector? Priority: HIGH

2.5 What steps have departments taken to try to address the needs of particular target groups for this initiative i.e., ethnocultural and visible minorities, aboriginal people, disabled persons, people in rural and isolated areas, and seniors? (Priority: HIGH)

2.6 To what extent did the activities of this Initiative complement, duplicate, overlap, or work at cross-purposes with other federal, provincial, territorial or voluntary or private sector programs? Priority: HIGH

2.7 What demonstrable effects have these activities had on public awareness and attention to Family Violence? Priority: HIGH

2.8 Has the program improved the national data base on family violence? Priority: HIGH

3. ISSUE THREE: IMPACTS/EFFECTS (What has happened as a result of the program?)

3.1 How successful have programs and/or projects been? What demonstrable effects have these activities had on the incidence of Family Violence?

3.1.1 What were the completion rates?

3.1.2 What were the impacts on the clients of services and products? Priority: MEDIUM

3.1.3 What were the end products of these activities? Priority: HIGH

3.1.4 What use was made of the end products?

3.1.4.1 Have participants in various programs, or recipients of services or information benefited from these outputs? Priority: MEDIUM/HIGH

3.1.4.2 Have sponsoring departments or the Corporation made available information on the results of successfully completed projects to other organizations and individuals? Have the recipients found this information useful? Priority: HIGH

3.1.5 What kinds of projects were most effective? What characterized the most effective projects (design models re treatment, training, professional guides, public information, housing, delivery of service, etc..) from the less effective ones? What are the implications for future funding priorities? Priority: MEDIUM

3.2 How satisfied were clients with the process of program/activity implementation? Priority: HIGH

3.3 How do parties in various federal, provincial, territorial departments/agencies, and outside government use the National Clearinghouse on Family Violence and the Family Violence Information Tracking System (FVITS)? How satisfied are Clearinghouse users with its services? How effective is the FVITS in tracking project information in terms of accuracy and comprehensiveness? Priority: HIGH

3.4 What were some other intended or unintended effects of the Initiative? Priority: HIGH

ISSUE FOUR: ALTERNATIVES (Are there better and more cost effective ways of achieving the objectives?)

4.1 Is the set of activities conducted by the various federal departments/ agencies the most cost-effective use of departmental funds given the impacts achieved?

4.1.1 Could the same or greater impacts have been achieved through other less costly activities or more efficient use of resources? Priority: HIGH

4.1.2 What suggestions have clients made for improvements to the Initiative? Priority: HIGH

4.1.3 Which program areas would be the most cost-effective and appropriate for the federal government to pursue in light of provincial priorities and concerns? Do some areas now require lesser or greater attention? Priority: HIGH

4.2 What have been the strengths and weaknesses of the funding approaches? Priority: MEDIUM

4.3 Has what the Family Violence Initiative attempted been commensurate with its resourcing and capabilities? Was it reasonable to expect these activities, resourced at these levels, to achieve the objectives of the Initiative? Priority: LOW

3.2 Proposed Methodological Approaches

Both quantitative and qualitative analysis will be used to interpret the data and information sources. Two methodological approaches will be employed to provide multiple levels of evidence:

- journalistic and logical analysis of program files, of literature, the results of expert conferences, of panels, case studies and of information derived from interviews and surveys;

- statistical analysis of primary and secondary data gathered thorough surveys, interviews and other means. This will include information on the reporting levels of family violence and its demographic characteristics.

3.3 Proposed Data Collection Methods

3.3.1 Statistics Canada Data Collection on Family Violence

A major data collection activities will be undertaken by Statistics Canada under a specialized data collection project in support of on-going program management and the future evaluation of this Initiative. This will provide baseline data in various aspects of family violence and document other supporting information. The proposed data collection and analyses by Statistics Canada is set out in "Strategy for the Collection and Analysis of National Family Violence Information", Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Statistics Canada, November 1990). The Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics (CCJS) has contracted with Health and Welfare Canada to establish a national database on the nature and extent of family violence and services to victims. This work will be done on a cost recovery basis with overall costs not to exceed $3.2 million.

The strategy consists of four general activities which are now underway:

- development of national surveys;

- development of provincial systems and data bases;

- development of analytical databases to support research and analysis; and

- the production of national summary reports.

The data gathering exercise comprises the following projects:

- **Wife Assault Survey**

  The CJSS, with the assistance of the General Social Survey Project (GSS) will undertake an enhanced wife assault survey as part of the next GSS cycle on criminal victimization in 1993. In addition to the regular victimization survey (sample, 10,000) a sample of approximately 20,000 adult women will be interviewed by telephone about their experiences as victims of violence by intimates and about their fear of victimization in the larger community. In addition to providing much needed new information about wife assault, this survey will contribute to a long range strategy to improve the ability of the GSS to measure the incidence, nature and extent of wife assault. (Completion date: December 1993)

- **Seniors Survey**

  Health and Welfare Canada, Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation and two other federal departments plan to conduct a national population survey of Canadians 45 years of age and over. This will involve a sample of 20-40,000 and address issues of independence, quality of life, coping strategies and healthy aging. Health and Welfare Canada will develop a supplementary module to tap incidence of abuse among seniors. This will provide a "social support" context within which to interpret this information. (Completion date: Summer 1992)

- **Transition House Survey**

  The Canadian Centre for Health Information at Statistics Canada conducts an on-going national survey on residential care facilities which includes transition homes for abused women. In consultation with Health and Welfare Canada, Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation, the provinces, provincial associations of transition houses, CCJS and the Canadian Centre for Health Information, Statistics Canada will expand the Residential Care Facilities survey to provide national data on housing and counselling services provided through transition homes. (Completion date: Fall, 1994)

- **Childhood Injuries Survey**

  The Laboratory Centre for Disease Control (LCDC) of Health and Welfare Canada has implemented a survey of the ten paediatric hospitals across Canada to collect information about injuries sustained by children. This includes intentional injuries. The objective is to tap this data base and augment its utility by supplying trained medical records technicians to extract relevant information about cases of suspected abuse beyond emergency services. This information would be supplemented with data from the Canadian Centre for Health Information, wherever possible. (Completion date: March, 1992)

- **Provincial Child Welfare Systems**

  Provincial departments responsible for child welfare maintain databases containing quantitative and qualitative information about known child abuse. The intention is to integrate and harmonize these data bases and to undertake statistical analysis of the quantitative data they contain. (Completion date: January, 1993)

- **Provincial Family Violence Initiatives**

  A number of jurisdictions have local or provincial initiatives underway to collect statistical information about cases of family violence that become known. It is intended to fund the development of local tracking systems in jurisdictions with family violence initiatives planned or underway.

- **Sentencing Data File**

  The revised Uniform Crime Reporting Survey will begin to generate statistical information about incidence of wife assault, child abuse and elder abuse reported to the police for a limited number of police departments. It is hoped that this survey will provide 70 percent coverage of known criminal incidents by 1993. A sub-sample of perpetrators of family violence identified through the Uniform Crime Reporting Survey will be tracked through the adult court system to provide information on conviction rates and sentencing patterns. (Completion date: April, 1992 with incremental growth)

- **Develop Historical Database and Analytical System**

  This project will centralize ongoing statistical information systems on family violence such as the Homicide Survey, the revised Uniform Crime Reporting System and provincial/local data bases into a microcomputer statistical system. Software will be developed to do trend analysis. (Completion date: March, 1995)

- **Subprovincial Cross-Sectional Data Base and Analytical System**

  The subprovincial (SubPro) database of CCJS combines justice data on activities by police, courts, correctional services and legal aid with 1986 census social and economic data. It will be updated with 1991 census data. The surveys/ databases developed on Family Violence thorough this Statistics Canada initiative will be integrated with the SubPro justice and demographic data to maximize the potential analytical use of this expanded data base. (Completion date: March, 1995)

- **Inventory of Services of Victims of Wife Assault**

  This project will develop an inventory of federally, provincially and locally funded programs for victims of wife assault, a well as descriptive information about legislative authority for specific activities. This will yield a national qualitative report within the first year of the Initiative. (Completion date: March, 1993)

- **National Qualitative Report**

  This involves the preparation of jurisdiction-specific reports covering description of services available to victims of family violence by the second year of the Initiative. (Completion date: March 1993)

- **National Summary Report**

  This includes the production in the fourth year of the Initiative of a national summary report synthesizing a review of the literature, the qualitative and descriptive data produced through the above projects and statistical analysis of the data base contained therein. (Completion date: March, 1995)

3.3.2 Other Data and Information Sources

Other methods of data/information collection in addition to those by Statistics Canada will include the following:

- analysis of relevant administrative and statistical data collected by all sponsoring departments and the Corporation for other purposes than this evaluation;
- review of program files and archives in the sponsoring departments and the Corporation;
- special contracts to qualified consultants, including case studies of selected projects;
- consultations with expert panels
- personal or telephone interviews with
  - officials of federal, provincial and territorial departments and agencies;
  - selected Non Government Organizations (NGOs) and professional associations;
  - Family Violence Initiative coordinators in all federal departments and agencies involved in the Family Violence initiative.
- mail surveys of
  - National Clearinghouse of Family Violence users;
  - service providers, professionals who attended any national conferences, workshops or training sessions on family violence and recipients of protection and housing assistance, etc.. (i.e. persons associated with the delivery of component programs or recipients of project funding);
  - persons who received copies of reports from various departmental sponsored Family Violence projects;
  - recipients of grants and contribution funding; and
  - provincial local and community officials who coordinated Family Violence consultations with the sponsoring departments and who participated in identification of relevant data elements in the development of the CCJS surveys and studies.

- use of the Statistics Canada General Social Survey (GSS) to capture other relevant statistics.

. analysis of the use of and necessary modifications to the HWC Family Violence Information Tracking System; and

. use made of CCJS surveys by federal, provincial and territorial governments and non-governmental organizations.

PART IV
EVALUATION OPTIONS

4.1 Final Evaluation Options

4.1.1 "Medium" Option (I)

This would encompass only the questions with a "HIGH" priority. It would exclude questions of "MEDIUM" or "LOW" priority (Questions, 3.1.2, 3.1.4.1, 3.1.5, 4.2 and 4.3).

4.1.2 "Maximal" Option (II)

This would include all the questions in all the priority groups, "HIGH", "MEDIUM" and "LOW". The omitted questions from the "LOW" and "MEDIUM" Option (I) are nevertheless important or interesting and would significantly augment the evaluative information base needed in support of any future policy decisions to extend or modify the federal Family Violence Initiative. It is therefore the recommended option.

It should be noted that for the final evaluation the data will be base line estimates and will not provide the basis for trend analysis of family violence variables. Consequently reliance will be placed primarily on qualitative analysis of perceptions/views of stakeholders obtained through surveys and personal interviews. Mostly qualitative rather than quantitative analysis will be used to illuminate the various categories of evaluation issues for the final evaluation.

4.2 Mid-Term Evaluation

The mid-term evaluation of the departmental/corporation program elements must be completed by January 31, 1992 in order to facilitate a roll-up and the preparation of a final report and summary by Health and Welfare Canada by March 31, 1992. Consequently, only an evaluation of what has happened in terms of process delivery, any outputs, impacts/effects and of the

efficiency of program delivery mechanisms during the first six-eight months of the Initiative can be provided. It will only be possible to assess the efficiency/effectiveness of the process and interdepartmental coordination functions for the new Initiative and explore, probe the issue of potential duplication of effort.

In the absence of significant experience with the various programs under the Initiative the mid-term evaluation will only provide indicators as to how well these programs are being further conceptualized or initially delivered. This will be supplemented by findings from interim or final evaluations of/the first federal Family Violence interdepartmental Initiative (1988-92) where available.

The analysis in support of the mid-term evaluation will be of three kinds: descriptive indicators of output achievement, analytical output, and of efficacy of central coordination.

Descriptive Indicators of Output Achievement

. Measures of how well program delivery processes are working within the sponsoring departments/corporation to include:

  - how many organizations have been assisted (applications pending or processed), amounts, purpose, targeted clients/populations and what was the outcome. This will rely on the development of simple performance indicators, e.g., percentages, tables, charts.

(The Health and Welfare Canada Family Violence Information Tracking System and departmental/corporation monitoring systems would be sources of information.)

. Descriptive measures of recent demand for subject-related information (National Clearinghouse on Family Violence).

. Descriptive measures of any action taken to seek partnerships with corporate and voluntary sector.

Analytical Measures

This module will largely be a subjective interpretation by clients, NGOs and other stakeholders as to whether the parallel and complimentary mandates were carried out in an integrated and purposive manner.

The focus of this module will determine:

- whether the proper organizations/beneficiaries will be, or were targeted;
- whether there are potential or actual overlaps or duplication with respect to intra-departmental funding;
- whether there are potential or actual overlaps or duplication with respect to inter-departmental funding;
- whether there are any potential or actual overlaps or duplication between aspects of federal and provincial funding activities; (but some overlapping may have reinforcing or beneficial effects and this should be so acknowledged).

The mid-term evaluation should reveal whether there is any need for mid-term correction in prioritization of funding. For example, in the event that it is perceived that provincial government funding is not adequately focused or harmonized with federal spending in broad program areas, what are now more appropriate areas for federal spending under the new Initiative?

Efficacy of Central Coordination

This will comprise an assessment of the operational effectiveness of the intra and inter-departmental coordination mechanisms, the committee structure charged with overall management and decision-making at all levels from approval of funding decisions to program evaluation and data collection in support of these roles.

Efficacy of Departmental Delivery and Administration of Funding

- How well were the various departmental/corporation initiatives formulated and managed within the sponsoring agencies?

Efficacy of Interdepartmental Coordination

- Was decision-making in each sponsoring department and CMHC adequately synchronized? How well was this done?
- How smoothly was data exchanged between the different sponsoring departments and/or the corporation?
- Are data collection efforts on track and being efficiently carried out?

- How well did the different committees charged with managing, or assisting with the management of the Initiative function?

- How effective is FVITS in tracking project information in terms of accuracy and comprehensiveness?

The Mid-Term evaluation will address aspects of some or all of the following evaluation questions:

New Initiative

Question 2.3 Were appropriate mechanisms (i.e. assessment criteria) put in place to facilitate coordination, prevent duplication and select among project proposals within and across funding departments and agencies and between federal, provincial, municipal, community, etc... departments or agencies?

Question 3.2 How satisfied were clients (or program administrators) with the process of program/activity implementation?

Question 3.3 How do parties in various federal, provincial, territorial etc... departments/agencies and outside government use the National Clearinghouse or Family Violence?

In assessing the effectiveness of the overall coordination of the initiative, every effort will be made to assure that it is carried out with objectivity and independence. To this effect an outside consultant will undertake this task for the mid-term and final evaluations.

The sponsoring departments or the Corporation may not be able to address all of these issues and at any great depth in the mid-term evaluation because of the lack of results for the new Initiative and the absence of data/information which will only be gathered for the final evaluation of the new Initiative.

Nevertheless, the mid-term evaluation will provide process-type information and assess the effectiveness of mechanisms in place to generate the expected outcomes. This will be supplemented by any findings on objective achievement and impacts and effects of the first interdepartmental Initiative (1988-92) where available.

4.3 Cost Effectiveness of Evaluation

There is a need to develop a solid base of evaluative information to advise policy-makers on the effectiveness of this initiative but to also do this in a cost-effective manner. In the course of developing this information, it will be important to weigh the benefits vis-a-vis the costs of collecting various types of information and of undertaking different kinds of analysis for the mid-term and final evaluation, in order to produce the best and most utilizable information at a reasonable cost.

APPENDIX A

Data Collection Methods and Indicators For the Evaluation Questions

APPENDIX A

QUESTION 1.1

"To what extent does the federal government continue to attach priority to the issue of Family Violence?

The priority for this question is "HIGH" (Essential to Evaluation)

The principle evaluation indicators for this question would be as follows:

Opinions of other Federal officials, Provincial officials, NGO officials, and professional associations. Also opinions of recipients of different kinds of assistance.

The main data sources would be as follows:

Expert panels; surveys or interviews of Federal, Provincial, NGO officials, program beneficiaries and professional associations.

The methods of collecting data would be:

interviews; surveys; expert opinion.

APPENDIX A

QUESTION 1.2

"Are current program activities still consistent with the overall objectives of the Initiative?"

The priority for this question is "HIGH" (Essential to Evaluation)

The principle evaluation indicators for this question would be as follows:

Expert opinions on currently appropriate definition of family violence and on adequacy and appropriateness of program activities in that context. Program re-definition as required. Comparison of responses to 1.1 above with program activities and goals. Official, and expert perception regarding the continuing validity of objectives, and utility and credibility of program contents. Evidence of thoughtful marketing of products and encouragement of new innovations or further research.

The main data sources would be as follows:

Expert panels; consultation documents and expert proceedings for any leads on this question; interviews with officials and associations regarding the comparative utility and credibility of various program elements.

The methods of collecting data would be:

Expert opinion; interviews; surveys

APPENDIX A

QUESTION 2.1

"What has happened as a result of the Initiative? Has there been an increase in the number, accessibility, and effectiveness of services in Canada for the prevention of, protection from, and treatment of Family Violence?"

The priority for this question is "HIGH" (Essential to Evaluation)

The principle evaluation indicators for this question would be as follows:

Opinions about whether number and effectiveness of services has increased. Number of clients served (care givers, victims, offenders) and measures of incremental benefits.

The main data sources would be as follows:

Statistics Canada national and regional Family Violence surveys; interviews of NGOs, Provincial Territorial and Federal departmental officials; expert panels, Provincial service inventories. Project Haven and Transition Housing data on clients. Any supplementary DIAND, MSB/HWC, FVPD/HWC, Justice Solicitor-General and Secretary of State data on victims, offenders and users/clients; User statistics from the HWC National Clearinghouse on Family Violence and HWC Family Violence Information Tracking System.

The methods of collecting data would be:

Statistics Canada Victimization, surveys; interviews; archival review; analysis of administrative data.

APPENDIX A

QUESTION 2.2

"To what extent can any increase in the number, accessibility; and effectiveness of services in Canada for the prevention of, protection from, and treatment of Family Violence be attributed wholly or partly to the effects of different federal department activities."

The priority for this question is "HIGH" (Essential to Evaluation)

The principle evaluation indicators for this question would be as follows:

Measures of attribution of improvement in services to federal individual or joint programs. Need to consider joint causes and effects; and necessary and sufficient conditions, and isolate any incremental effects.

The main data sources would be as follows:

Statistics Canada Family Violence surveys and data gathering/interpretation, documentation; surveys or interviews with NGOs, Professional Associations (representing those delivering services), and departmental project funding recipients or beneficiaries.

The methods of collecting data would be:

Statistics Canada surveys, interviews, archival reviews

APPENDIX A

QUESTION 2.3

"Were appropriate mechanisms (ie. assessment criteria) put in place to facilitate coordination, prevent duplication and select among project proposals within and across funding departments and agencies and between federal, provincial, municipal, community, etc., departments/agencies? Are there more cost-effective ways that might have been used to fund or administer the Initiatives". Priority: HIGH

The priority for this question is "HIGH" (essential to evaluation)

The provincial evaluation indicators for this question would be has follows:

Opinion of federal officials, provincial officials, NGOs and professional associations which participate in decision-making in this area.

The main sources of information would be as follows:

An impartial assessment of the operational effectiveness of the interdepartmental coordination mechanism. This would evaluate the group dynamics of decision making/coordination and verify that resources were allocated efficiently and effectively across various needs.

Method of data collection would be:

interviews, expert opinion and focus groups.

APPENDIX A

QUESTION 2.4

"To what extent have the activities conducted under the Initiatives resulted in increased attention to the problem of Family Violence by provincial and territorial governments and Non-Government Organizations, as evidenced by the introduction of new services, new delivery approaches, new policies? What effect did it have as partnerships and cooperation among federal, provincial, territorial governments, communities and the voluntary sector?"

The priority for this question is "HIGH" (Essential to Evaluation)

The principle evaluation indicators for this question would be as follows:

Opinions of provincial territorial officials and other stakeholders consulted re priority attached to family violence issues; any increases in provincial, municipal budgets for community based treatment and prevention, expert panel opinions.

The main data sources would be as follows:

Surveys or interviews with Federal, and Provincial officials, native groups and other stakeholders. Review of appropriate Program files. Statistics Canada and other data on provincial expenditures.

The methods of collecting data would be:

Interviews; Archival review; expert opinion; public opinion survey.

APPENDIX A

QUESTION 2.5

"What steps have departments taken to try to address the needs of particular target groups for this initiative, i.e. ethnocultural and visible minorities, aboriginal people, disabled persons, people in rural and isolated areas, and seniors?

The priority for this question is "HIGH" (Essential to Evaluation)

The principle evaluation indicators for this question would be as follows:

Data on categories of direct or indirect program beneficiairies from departments, CMHC and the Family Violence Information Tracking Systems (FVITS), and opinions of other Federal, Provincial officials, NGO's, experts and professional associations.

The main data sources would be as follows:

FVITS and departmental/agency monitoring systems (including those of Multiculturalism and Citizenship) and expert interviews and/or panels.

The methods of collecting data would be:

Expert opinion; interviews; surveys; and data collection thorough the FVITS.

APPENDIX A

QUESTION 2.6

"To what extent do the activities of this Initiative complement, duplicate, overlap, or work at cross purposes with other Federal provincial, territorial or voluntary sector programs?"

The priority for this question is "HIGH" (Essential to Evaluation)

The principle evaluation indicators for this question would be as follows:

Opinions of selected federal, provincial and territorial officials, native groups and other stakeholders. Opinions of beneficiaries or knowledgeable experts as to overlaps or duplications between Federal and other efforts.

The main data sources would be as follows:

Surveys or interviews of federal, provincial and territorial officials, native groups, etc... (service deliverers).

The methods of collecting data would be:

Interviews; surveys

APPENDIX A

QUESTION 2.7

"What demonstrative effects have these activities had on public awareness and sense of concern over Family Violence?"

The priority for this question is "HIGH" (Essential to evaluation)

The principle evaluation indicators for this question would be as follows:

Media monitoring by Family Violence Prevention Division, HWC, other departments and CMHC and use of periodic public opinion surveying.

The main data sources would be as follows:

Media monitoring. Contract with specialized media consultant to do the analysis. Use of periodic public opinion sampling.

The methods of collecting data would be:

Archival review, media monitoring and periodic public opinion surveying.

APPENDIX A

QUESTION 2.8

"Has the program improved the national data base on family violence?"

The priority for this question is "HIGH" (Essential to Evaluation)

The principle evaluation indicators for this question would be as follows:

Documentation on an use of statistics from Canadian Centre For Justice Statistics, the HWC National Clearinghouse on Family Violence and Family Violence Information Tracking Systems, and other departmental data bases. Opinions regarding the utility, accessibility and availability of such data.

The main data sources would be as follows:

Special survey of users of such data bases. Surveys or interviews with all interested parties e.g., NGOs, Professional Associations, and project funding recipients who might have used these data sources.

The methods of collecting data would be:

Survey; interviews and archival review

APPENDIX A

QUESTION 3.1.1

"How successful have programs and/or projects been? What were the completion rates?."

The priority for this question is "HIGH" (Essential to Evaluation)

The principle evaluation indicators for this question would be as follows:

Completion rates of projects registered on HWC's Family Violence Information Tracking System (FVITS) and other federal departmental/agency monitoring systems, cross tabulated by major activity.

The main data sources would be as follows:

FVITS and departmental/agency monitoring systems.

The methods of collecting data would be:

Analysis of administrative data.

Other:

CMHC refers to 'projects' as housing projects which are distinct buildings covered under one loan agreement with one specific sponsor group. Project Haven would be considered a demonstration program. CMHC does not evaluate individual projects but the program as a whole. On the other hand other departments HWC, DIAND, etc... evaluate individual projects which have specific expenditures.

APPENDIX A

QUESTION 3.1.2

"How successful have programs and/or funded projects been? What were the impacts on the clients of services and products?"

The priority for this question is "HIGH" (Essential to Evaluation)

The principle evaluation indicators for this question would be as follows:

Impact/findings as per end product reports or project evaluation.

The main data sources would be as follows:

Project files which contain reports evaluating client impacts. FVITS and departmental/agency monitoring systems and project evaluations will be the sources of this information. Literature review of these reports.

The methods of collecting data would be:

Archival review

Other:

The quality of the information would depend on the availability and quality of reports submitted by project staff. A copy of each final report will be sent to the National Clearinghouse on Family Violence. Departments/CMHC may have to be selective and identify useable information. Preferably departments and the Corporation should develop guidelines to assure credible evaluations of their projects if they do not already have these.

APPENDIX A

QUESTION 3.1.3

"How successful have programs and/or funded projects been? What were the products of these activities?"

The priority for this question is "HIGH" (Essential to Evaluation)

The principle evaluation indicators for this question would be as follows:

End product rates and breakdown by type of product is registered on HWC's Family Violence Information Tracking System (FVITS) and other federal departmental/agency monitoring systems by major activity. As well one copy of the final report from a funded project is to be sent to the National Clearinghouse on Family violence.

The main data sources would be as follows:

FVITS and departmental/agency monitoring systems, project and report files.

The methods of collecting data would be:

Analysis of administrative data

APPENDIX A

QUESTION 3.1.4.1

"How successful have programs and/or funded projects been? What uses were made of the end products? Have participants in various programs, or recipients of services or information benefited from these outputs?"

The priority for this question is "MEDIUM"/"HIGH" (Important, or Essential, to Evaluation)

The principle evaluation indicators for this question would be as follows:

Numbers of persons receiving services, or attending sessions or recipients among those targeted. Proportion of victims, offenders receiving and benefiting from services. Proportions of professionals contacted or of trainees still working in the field. Proportions of contacts or trainees reporting they use material taught. Opinions of victims, offenders, professionals on the quality of services, information (information kits distributed both immediately after services and in follow up).

The main data sources would be as follows:

Surveys of information recipients and those exposed to training materials. Review of departmental/agency files for any reports on assessments submitted by funded projects. The same for information kits, possibly using pre addressed and stamped return questionnaire or postcard inserts. Project evaluation roll-ups would be another source of information.

The methods of collecting data would be:

Surveys; archival review

Other:

This requires that projects maintain a mailing list of persons benefiting from the training or using the materials or alternatively that training projects submit after the event treatment, training, etc..., evaluations to department/ corporation as an end product. It should not be particularly expensive, would provide reasonably good evaluative data to the Department/Corporation and would be much less expensive than trying to survey trainees and recipients of services long after the fact. Answering this question is rated as "MEDIUM/HIGH", owing to the difficulty and expense of systematically obtaining reliable information to answer the question and permit cross-project comparison. But this kind of documentation is something the department/Corporation ideally should require of projects.

APPENDIX A

QUESTION 3.1.4.2

"How successful have funded projects been? What uses were made of the end products? Have sponsoring departments made available the information on the results of successfully completed projects to other organizations or individuals? Have these third parties found this information useful?"

The priority for this question is "MEDIUM" (Important but not essential to Evaluation)

Though this question is very important, it is given a lower priority because answering it could be difficult and expensive, relative to the contribution the answer would make to the overall evaluation.

The principle evaluation indicators for this question would be as follows:

Uses made of findings of successfully completed projects to third parties as reported either by funding recipient or by persons to whom information reports were distributed. Proportion of end product reports filed with HWC Clearinghouse. Proportion of reports requested from Clearinghouse. Evidence of marketing of report by HWC, Family Violence Preventive Division (FVPD) staff to other interested parties.

The main data sources would be as follows:

Survey of funding recipients asking them what uses have been made of their work under the program; asking them to report any third party requests. HWC, National Clearinghouse on Family Violence data base. Interviews with FVPD officials regarding marketing of reports and effectiveness of the marketing function. Survey of organizations or persons receiving copies of reports.

The methods of collecting data would be:

Survey; analysis of administrative data.

Other:

The Clearinghouse and FVPD will keep computer records of names and addressed of persons to whom they sent reports of Initiative funded projects. Need to insure also code basic demographic and employed information on persons to whom distributed.

APPENDIX A

QUESTION 3.1.5

"How successful have the funded projects been? Which kinds of projects were the most effective? What characterized the more effective projects (design models re training, public information, treatment, professional guides, housing, information delivery of services, etc...) from the less effective ones? What are the implications for future funding priorities?"

The priority for this question is "MEDIUM" (Important, but not Essential, to Evaluation)

This is a very important question, but it is given a lower priority because answering would be time consuming, expensive and difficult to answer unless there were clear losers.

The principle evaluation indicators for this question would be as follows:

Professional judgement by an impartial consultant, derived from case studies of a small sample of projects, perhaps stratified between large ($100K) projects and small ones. Evidence of success might be that province or other agencies picked up funding once it ended.

The main data sources would be as follows:

Case studies conducted by consultants. Need to insure representativeness of samples chosen. Might also pick randomly selected (stratified) "model projects". Have consultants verify the "model projects" were successful and judge what the key differences were between successful model projects and case study findings. Interviews or survey of funding recipients to find out if Province or others picked up funding. Use of expert panels to review and comments on the findings and suggestions of consultants.

The methods of collecting data would be:

Expert opinion and panels; interviews; analysis of administrative data; archival reviews.

APPENDIX A

QUESTION 3.2

"How satisfied were client with the process of program/activity implementation?

The priority for this question is "HIGH" (Essential to Evaluation)

The principle evaluation indicators for this question would be as follows:

Personal interviews on surveys of clients/beneficiaries and service deliverers aspects of efficiency in program delivery e.g., how long did it take to receive funding from the time of application? Were there avoidable or unavoidable bottlenecks to program delivery? How helpful were federal field personnel?

The main data sources would be as follows:

Interviews or surveys

The methods of collecting data would be:

Interviews or surveys

APPENDIX A

QUESTION 3.3

"How do parties in various federal, provincial, territorial departments/ agencies and outside government use the National Clearinghouse and the Family Violence Information Tracking System (FVITS)? How satisfied are Clearinghouse users with its services? How effective is the FVITS in tracking project information in terms of accuracy and comprehensiveness?

The priority for this question is "HIGH" (Essential to Evaluation)

The principle evaluation indicators for this question would be as follows:

Opinions of Clearinghouse and FVITS users, potential users, including those within and outside government, on the usefulness of information obtained. Comparison of activities of the National Clearinghouse on Family Violence with an objective consultant's report on the effectiveness of marketing efforts by the Clearinghouse. Statistics from Clearinghouse and FVITS reports on trends on usage. Of particular interest is whether potential users know about the Clearinghouse, and if so why they do not use it if this is the case.

The main data sources would be as follows:

Survey of a sample of persons who requested information from the Clearinghouse. Interviews with federal provincial, territorial officials with NGO and professional associations. Clearinghouse annual reports.

The methods of collecting data would be:

Survey; interviews; archival review and analysis of administrative data to supplement information from Clearinghouse reports.

APPENDIX A

QUESTION 3.4

"What were some other intended or unintended effects of the Initiative?"

The priority for this question is "HIGH" (Essential to Evaluation)

The principle evaluation indicators for this question would be as follows:

Opinions expressed in reply to questions added to surveys and interviews. These would include: assessments of the quality of help and advice from project managers/consultants in various sponsoring departments and the Corporation; examples of unexpected ways in which projects might have benefitted recipients, e.g., ability of recipients to get funding from Provinces or elsewhere once project is ended.

The main data sources would be as follows:

Surveys and interviews conducted for other purposes.

The methods of collecting data would be:

Survey; interviews

APPENDIX A

QUESTION 4.1.1

Is the set of activities conducted by the various federal departments/agencies the most cost-effective use of government funds given the impacts achieved? Could the same or greater impacts have been achieved through the less costly activities or more efficient use of resources?

The priority for this question is "HIGH" (Essential to Evaluation)

The principle evaluation indicators for this question would be as follows:

Conclusions from question 3.1 and its subsidiary questions. Opinions of federal, provincial departmental officials and other stakeholders.

The main data sources would be as follows:

Answers to question 3.1 and subsidiary questions. Interviews with clients, federal, provincial officials and other stakeholders.

The methods of collecting data would be:

Interviews

APPENDIX A

QUESTION 4.1.2

"Is the set of activities conducted by the various federal departments/agencies the most cost-effective use of government funds given the impacts achieved? What suggestions have clients and other stakeholders made for improvements to the Initiatives?"

The priority for this question is "HIGH" (Essential to Evaluation)

The principle evaluation indicators for this question would be as follows:

Conclusions from question 3.1 and its subsidiary questions. Opinions of federal and provincial officials and other stakeholders.

The main data sources would be as follows:

Answers to question 3.1 and subsidiary questions. Interviews with clients, federal, provincial officials and other stakeholders.

The methods of collecting data would be:

Interviews

APPENDIX A

QUESTION 4.1.3

"Which program areas would be the most cost-effective and appropriate for the federal government to pursue in light of provincial priorities and concerns? Do some areas require lesser or greater attention?

The priority for this question is "HIGH" (Essential to Evaluation)

The principle evaluation indicators for this question would be as follows:

Conclusions from question 3.1 and its subsidiary questions. Opinions of departmental officials and the others.

The main data sources would be as follows:

Answers to question 3.1 and subsidiary questions. Interviews with clients, federal and provincial departmental/agency officials and other stakeholders.

The methods of collecting data would be:

Interviews

APPENDIX A

QUESTION 4.2

"What have been the strengths and weaknesses of the funding approaches? Is this the best way to channel funding for new initiatives?"

The priority for this question is "MEDIUM" (Important, but not Essential, to Evaluation)

The principle evaluation indicators for this question would be as follows:

Opinions of departmental/agency officials and funding program recipients. Also ask applicants whether they were familiar with various programs and whether it helped them, to apply under an already know programs and processes (where applicable).

The main data sources would be as follows:

Add these questions to interviews with departmental/agency officials. Include questions on this topic in recipients' survey.

The methods of collecting data would be:

Interviews; survey

Other:

The question has a lower priority, as it is primarily concerned with internal Departmental/agency processes rather than with the impact of the Initiative.

APPENDIX A

QUESTION 4.3

"Has what the Family Violence Initiative attempted been commensurate with its resourcing and capabilities? Was it reasonable to expect these activities, resources at these levels, to achieve the objectives of the Initiative?"

The priority for this question is "LOW" (Interesting question but neither important nor essential to the evaluation)

The principle evaluation indicators for this question would be as follows:

Opinions from various parties inside and outside the programs supplemented it need be by workload measures.

The main data sources would be as follows:

Add these questions to most interview and surveys. Any National Forum or other proceedings (e.g. provincial consultations documents) might also be sources of information. Review program correspondence files for evidence on whether there were problems with inadequacy of funding and person-years for administration.

The methods of collecting data would be:

Interviews; survey; archival review; analysis of administrative data. Time and motion studies (workloads analysis) if deemed necessary.

Other:

This could be time consuming, difficult and expensive to answer.